REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19-21, 23, and 28-30 are now pending in this application. New claims 28-30 have been added. Claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended. Claims 4, 6-9, 13, 15-18, 22, and 24-27 were canceled in Applicant's April 5, 2005 communication, thus, the rejections of those claims are now moot. The present invention is not anticipated by, nor obvious in view of US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0107755 to Steed et al. and US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0020715 to Chinn et al. as these prior art references do not disclose or suggest the claimed features of the present invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

A.   Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102

In the final Office Action issued January 12, 2006, claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19-21 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Steed et al., U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0107755 (Steed) in view of Chinn et al., U.S. Published Application No. 2002/0010715.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the present invention according to claims 1, 10, and 19 is not taught by the combination of Steed and Chinn. Steed discloses a server-based electronic wallet system that detects at a proxy that a wireless device is attempting to access a form from a merchant server. In

particular, the proxy identifies an attempt to access a form from a merchant server, where the form requires information to be entered; automatically fills the form with user data; and delivers the filled-form to a wireless device through the gateway, together with a hyperlink to a file stored on a wallet server. The user can select the option to use a server side wallet to fill up the pay page. When the user selects this option the wallet proxy intelligently directs the request to the wallet client together with all the necessary information to authenticate the user to the wallet client. The wallet client processes this information and places a request to "the wallet server to furnish appropriate values for the fields in the merchant's pay page." The wallet server extracts the user's credit card information and the merchant's pay page profile and tries to match all the fields with the appropriate user information. If successful, this is returned to the wallet interface software, which performs the task of filling up the WML form (i.e. auto-filling the merchant's pay page with user data from the wallet client) and returning it to the user's mobile phone.

By contrast, the present invention, for example, according to claim 1, requires, if no mappings for the form exist, transmitting the form to the mobile device, receiving from the user of the mobile device at least one selection of information to be entered into the at least one field of the form into which information is to be entered, creating a mapping for the form *"that specifies how to fill-in fields in the form into which stored information is to be entered"* based on the received at least one selection of information from the user of the mobile

device, and transmitting the form including the at least one selection of information to the application program." Steed discloses that "the wallet server furnishes appropriate values for the fields in the merchant's pay page." Steed does not disclose creating a mapping for the form that specifies how to fill-in fields in the form into which stored information is to be entered based on the information that is received into the form from the user of the mobile device.

Chinn et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Steed. The paragraphs of Chinn et al. identified by the Examiner does not teach or suggest creating a mapping for a form based on a received selection of information. The paragraphs identified by the Examiner merely disclose that a form can be mapped to a create a form node in a navigation tree for semantic retrieval for voice based browsing. See Chinn et al. paragraphs 0008 and 0095. Nowhere does Chinn et al. disclose creating mapping for a form that specifies how to fill-in fields in the form into which stored information is to be entered based on a received selection of information for the form. Accordingly, the combination of Steed and Chinn et al. does not teach the invention of claim 1. Claims 10, and 19 recite similar limitations as claim 1 and is not taught for at least the same reasons with respect to claim 1.

In addtition, Steed nor Chinn disclose that the information retrieved to enter into the at least one field of the form is stored in a location specifically associated

with the form and the field as recited in claims 28-30. For example, in the present invention, at least one wallet is specifically associated with a form and a compartment in the wallet is associated with, and stores the data for, a particular field in the wallet. compartment.

Claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19-21 and 23 depend from claims 1, 10, and 19 respectively. As discussed with respect to claims 1, 10 and 19, the combination of Steed and Chinn et al. does not teach the invention of claim 1, 10, and 19. Accordingly, the combination of Steed and Chinn et al. fails to teach the invention of claims 1-3, 5, 10-12, 14, 19-21 and 23.

Additional Fees:

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 19-5127 (19111.0059).

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, all of the Examiner's rejections to the claims are believed to be overcome. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and issuance of a Notice of Allowance for all the claims remaining in the application. Should the Examiner feel further communication would facilitate prosecution, he is urged to call the undersigned at the phone number provided below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michael A. Schwartz 40,161
for

Chadwick A. Jackson
Reg. No. 46,495

Dated: June 27, 2006

Bingham McCutchen LLP
3000 K Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 373-6661